

The Sun

WILLIAM M. LAFAN.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1904.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second-Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	50
DAILY, Per Year	600
SUNDAY, Per Year	200
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	800
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	70

Postage to foreign countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.

PARIS—Kloster No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and Klokoe No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

Our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication will be pleased to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Just What Mr. Hay Is Attempting.

The exact purport of Secretary Hay's note to the Powers ought to be understood by everybody; for its phraseology, as now officially disclosed, is very different from the scheme of guaranteed neutrality and territorial integrity for China which common report at first made it seem to be, and also very different in the essential particular from the version published in Paris on Thursday.

We reprint the text of the Secretary's note of instructions to the American representatives at St. Petersburg, Tokio and Pekin:

"You will express to the Minister of Foreign Affairs the earnest desire of the Government of the United States that in the course of the military operations which have begun between Russia and Japan the neutrality of China, and in all practicable ways her administrative entity, shall be respected by both parties, and that the area of hostilities shall be localized and limited as much as possible, so that undue excitement and disturbance of the Chinese people may be prevented and the least possible loss to the commerce and peaceful enterprise of the world may be occasioned.

"JOHN HAY."

At the same time our Department of State communicated this note to all the Governments which signed the protocol at Pekin, and requested similar action on their part.

This is simply an attempt—and what appears likely to be an entirely successful attempt—by Mr. HAY to induce both of the combatants to agree of their own volition to localize the war and to refrain from dragging China into anarchy. It is a legitimate exercise of his characteristic diplomacy, and if it accomplishes his purpose he will be entitled to the profound gratitude of the world.

The note written at Washington contains not the faintest suggestion of an alliance or concert of the Powers, including the United States, which shall become responsible guarantors of China's neutrality and integrity during and after the present war; and absolutely no commitment on our part to any military action in the future to enforce neutrality or to safeguard "administrative entity" in China or anywhere else.

The confidence which THE SUN expressed, when contrary reports were in circulation here and in Europe, that it was a mistake to attribute such a plan to one of the sanest and safest of American statesmen, is now shown to have been fully warranted by the facts.

Progress of the Boll Weevil War.

Citizens who desire to see the little insect from Mexico that has caused the cotton planters of Texas so much loss will find it at the American Museum of Natural History, exhibited in its different stages of growth. Alongside the weevil are maps indicating the recent rapid extension of the pest from its original home in Mexico over the cotton raising area of Texas.

This insect is a beetle which deposits its eggs in the young cotton boll. The developing larva finds food to its taste in the cotton producing tissue, and thus either prevents the formation of cotton or greatly injures the product. At the museum both affected and unaffected cotton bolls are shown.

The bulletin just issued by the Department of Agriculture says that up to this time the weevil has been found in only three places outside the cotton fields of Texas. A comparison of the crops in ten Texas counties before and after the weevil began its ravages indicates that the damage it does in fields where it has full swing amounts to about 50 per cent. of the crop. The boll weevil, upon this basis, caused a loss to the cotton planters of Texas during the past season of about \$15,000,000. At the same rate, if the pest were to spread over the entire cotton belt and no means were found to prevent damage, the loss would amount to \$250,000,000.

Although no hope is held out that the weevil can be entirely eliminated, the work of the division of entomology in the past three seasons is believed to have demonstrated that it is possible to produce cotton profitably in spite of the enemy. The field experiments seem to prove that with proper methods the damage may be reduced so that the weevil will not be a serious menace. As the last two annual reports of the Secretary of Agriculture have indicated, all the results of the first two years in investigations have pointed to this conclusion; and it has been strongly fortified by the results of the studies made during the past cotton season.

The Department advises planters to plant early, to give the fields thorough cultivation, to keep the cotton rows from four to five feet apart, to burn all vegetable matter remaining in the fields after cotton picking, and to use fertilizers to hasten the maturity of the plants.

A cotton field thus treated during the past season, at Wharton, Tex., in the heart of the infected region, yielded a bale of cotton to the acre, or about twice the average crop in the cotton belt, and seven or eight times the average crop per acre in Wharton county since the weevil began to diminish the yield. This is only one of many experiments demonstrating the practical value of the above advice to cotton planters.

The work of combating the weevil is now to be extended under the appropriation recently made by Congress. A plan of campaign has just been adopted by the Department of Agriculture. The work is to continue in charge of Mr.

HUNTER, who will be stationed at the laboratory in Victoria, Tex. All remedial expedients that can be devised will be carried on at the laboratory and at thirteen experimental farms of 100 acres each in different parts of the State. Demonstration work will be organized throughout Texas to prove to farmers that they may grow cotton successfully, weevil or no weevil. At the same time, other insects and conditions injurious to the cotton plant will be studied and experiments made in the breeding of earlier varieties of cotton which, it is believed, are less liable to damage.

The problem of the cotton boll weevil seems to be similar to that of the San José scale. There is little prospect that the spread of these pests among the cotton fields and orchards can be prevented. But there are good reasons for believing in both cases that the insects may be controlled so that the damage they inflict will be small, and, in fact, will not interfere much with the profits of cotton and fruit raising.

The Policy of the Canadian Liberals.

On Jan. 29 we commented upon the policy of the Conservative party in Canada as announced by the leader of that party, the Hon. R. L. BORDEN. The policy of the Liberals was declared by Premier LAURIER in a speech which he made at Montreal on the night of Feb. 6.

Two issues of dominant importance appear in Canada's politics to-day. These are the tariff and the projected transcontinental railway. The position of his party in regard to the tariff was set forth by Sir WILFRID in the following words:

"I may remind you that a tariff for revenue is our policy; that it has always been the policy of the Liberal party; that it was adopted by the great convention held at Ottawa in 1893; that it was the programme with which we presented ourselves to the electors in 1896.

"Canada, under the influence of this tariff, has come out from the humble position in which she was, and from being a simple colony the Dominion has been raised to the rank of a nation, and to-day Canadians have confidence in their country, and the name of Canada has fixed the attention of the civilized world.

"An unduly high tariff produces combines, produces trusts, and what would happen if we adopted the whole American tariff is that the consumers of Canada would apply to us for protection against protection.

"We reformed the tariff in 1897, but since then new conditions have arisen, and the day will certainly come when the Government will again have to take into serious consideration the necessity of reforming the tariff. When that time comes we will reform the tariff, we will follow the same principles which we adopted in 1897; that is to say, we will give justice to the consumers without injustice to the man who produces, and leaving to the working man the employment to which he is a right."

Sir WILFRID cited the statistics of Canadian development during recent years, and claimed for his party and its policy the credit for that development. An analysis of Canada's political history and economic progress does not entirely support the claims thus made.

During the Mackenzie Government, from 1873 to 1878, there was trade depression throughout the Dominion, and the national revenues showed large deficits because of limited receipts from the custom houses. An election followed in 1878. Sir JOHN MACDONALD led the Conservatives upon a platform which has ever since been known as the "National Policy." It was, in effect, a distinct policy of protection, though not of high protection such as is demanded by the Conservatives of to-day. Mr. MACKENZIE led his party in a vigorous struggle for a continuance of control upon a platform of tariff for revenue only, and was overwhelmingly defeated. A protective tariff, although moderate in character, was adopted in 1879. This policy was maintained by the Conservatives, through successive elections, until the Liberals came into power in 1896, with Sir WILFRID LAURIER as Premier. Their victory was due to influences with which the tariff question was in no way connected. It is claimed by the Conservatives, with evident justification, that Canada's remarkable progress during the last ten years is due primarily and almost entirely to the policy which they inaugurated and to the conditions which they established during their eighteen years of control of the affairs of the Dominion.

While Canadian prosperity is perhaps chiefly attributable to the bounty of nature and to the individual industry and activity of the Canadian people, irrespective of party, it is a fact that the free trade or tariff for revenue Liberals have not dared to attempt any material change in the tariff drafted or in the policy adopted by the Conservatives. But the fact of great progress and development during the Liberal regime is regarded by the Liberals as conclusive proof that they and they alone are entitled to the credit for it all.

The real difference between the two parties to-day, notwithstanding Sir WILFRID's assertion that the policy of his party is one of tariff for revenue only, is easily stated. The Liberal party virtually stands upon the ground occupied by the Conservatives ten years ago. The Conservatives, the authors of the protective policy, have advanced still further in the line of their original policy. To-day they advocate a wider measure of protection, a higher tariff by which the Canadian market shall be better secured for the Canadian producer and manufacturer. Were the Liberals to go before the country now on an issue of free trade they would unquestionably repeat the experience of Mr. MACKENZIE in 1878. Sir WILFRID's words about tariff reform are as vague as those of some of our own politicians, and mean nothing that a reader may choose to make them mean. A recent cartoon in the *Toronto Globe* represents a Canadian workman who asks Mr. BORDEN, the Conservative leader, what he means by "adequate protection." Mr. BORDEN replies that "adequate" is "a diplomatic term, and means—er—almost anything, you know."

This definition will apply with equal accuracy to Sir WILFRID's "tariff reform."

It was supposed that the vigorous and prolonged discussion during the last session of Parliament had settled the question of the new transcontinental railway in favor of its construction. Various obstacles have been encountered, however, and it now seems probable

that the whole matter will have to be threshed over again. As a party the Liberals will stand, as they did last year, in favor of the railway.

Rapid Transit for Pension Bills.

Friday the House of Representatives in Committee of the Whole considered the business on the Private Calendar. Three hundred and twenty bills granting a pension or increase of pension were read, amended and laid aside with a favorable recommendation. The Speaker asked the attention of the House. A large number of bills had been reported from the Committee of the Whole with the recommendation that they pass. Did any member want any one of them considered separately? If not, the Speaker would ask for unanimous consent to let those bills be considered as engrossed, ordered to a third reading, read a third time and passed, upon the reading of the numbers by the clerk.

Nobody objected. Thereupon 193 bills as amended were passed by the reading of their titles. Then thirty-six bills without amendment were passed in the same way. The Speaker directed the clerk to read the numbers of the Senate bills. These were to be passed as swiftly, but the Hon. DAVID E. FINLEY of South Carolina did not think this course of procedure proper in a legislative body. He insisted that the bills take the regular course. So the next bill, granting a pension to GREEN B. YAWN, was reported by the clerk.

"The Speaker—The question is on the amendment. Does the gentleman desire the amendment read?"

"Mr. FINLEY—No, I do not."

"The Speaker—The Chair does not know what the amendment is."

"Mr. FINLEY—Let the Chair have it read for his own satisfaction."

"Mr. FINLEY—It ought to be read."

This bill and three others were disposed of in the regular fashion. The House found life too short. Mr. ROBINSON, an Indiana Democrat, asked unanimous consent that the Senate bills reported by the Committee of the Whole without amendment be passed in the Speaker's double-quick way. Mr. FINLEY had either tired himself out or left the House. The remaining ninety-one bills were put through in short order.

As most members have their pro rata share of these bills, the rapid disposal of them is satisfactory to the House. In spring, prepare for the fall elections. Mr. CANNON has a sympathetic appreciation of the feelings of his brother Representatives.

Canada's Premier Declares His Love.

In the course of his speech at Montreal, Sir WILFRID LAURIER again expressed his unlimited admiration for certain features in the life of the people of the United States, and declared that he loved this republic. But he says that we "sin by exaggeration." Among our offenses in that direction he includes the following, and notes its results:

"The United States unhappily have exaggerated their fiscal system. They have really exaggerated their tariff of protection, and by that fact they have destroyed their own work, they have destroyed their own commerce, they have destroyed their own security, they have destroyed their own property, they have established in consequence in their high places trusts and in their low places strikes."

It is to be hoped that the United States will survive these accumulated disasters, and that Canada will adopt a fiscal policy which will enable her people to get along under their burdens as well as we have under ours.

The Turk's Interest in the Far Eastern Struggle.

A correspondent writes from Constantinople that the Turks are watching with deep interest the events in the Far East. They do not disguise their hope that the complications in which Russia has become involved will leave them free of her interference in their affairs for a long time to come.

If the Powers would consent, the Sultan's Government would be more than pleased to let the whole of the Black Sea squadron through the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, providing the Japanese would guarantee that it should never return. So long as that fleet exists to exercise a material pressure almost within gunshot of the palace, however, the political influence is there, and will remain, for the Turk is a great respecter of force. At the same time, there is a fear that the respite he hopes for through Russia's troubles at the other end of Asia will be disturbed by the Bulgarians at an early date.

It is true that the mission of BORIS SARAFOFF to Rome was a failure on all sides. He showed himself wanting in political acumen when he made his proposal to the Papal Secretary of State that in return for the Pope's protection the Bulgarian people would go over to the Catholic faith.

That trick was successfully played on the Emperor NAPOLEON III. by the veteran agitators BALABANOFF and ZANKOFF not very long before the Franco-German War. Mr. BALABANOFF used to relate with glee how with tear-streaming eyes he fell on his knees before the French Emperor, imploring aid for his people, who, in gratitude, would join the Catholic Church. The Emperor, beguiled by the specious promises of the Bulgarian emissaries, set his diplomacy in motion; but he succeeded only in raising trouble for France, while the Bulgarians remained as before.

The Papal Secretary had probably heard of this episode; hence his reply to M. SARAFOFF to go back to Bulgaria and, as soon as the conversion of the nation was fully accomplished, to return to Rome, and he would then see what could be done.

What the Turks fear, however, is not the Bulgarian agitators and the Macedonian insurgents, but the Bulgarian army that is straining to be let loose to avenge the cruelties to their fellow countrymen in the Adrianople vilayet and in Macedonia; and the probability that if hostilities do break out, the Austrians will move down into Albania and Kosovo, and the British will see that Greece receives her due in the ultimate settlement.

It is only the chauvinists among the

Turks who want a war. The Sultan and the responsible men in the affairs of the Government are under no illusions as to what the consequences of aggression on their part would be, whether Russia became too deeply involved to take an active part in the trouble or not.

Spanked by the Farmer's Hand.

The Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD of Texarkana and the First Texas Congress district, is now "going on" twenty-nine. When he is older he will not speak so irreverently as he has recently spoken of a hallowed institution like Government seeds. "Government chromes in pink and blue," he called them in the House the other day; and he read a flip-pant letter from a constituent who asked for a "union suit of clothes, a coat 38-size, pants 33-34." Mr. SHEPPARD was duly rebuked at the time. Other Representatives know how to "stand up for the farmer."

We are especially grateful for the seed-manlike and statesmanlike remarks made by the Hon. EZEKIEL SAMUEL CANDLER of Corinth, Miss., Feb. 5. They have been ripening since then and appear in full flower in the *Congressional Record* of Feb. 12. When "anybody strikes a blow at the distribution of seeds which go to the farmers and laboring men of this country and the people generally," Mr. CANDLER rightly thinks that it is time to say something for seeds and the people. Feb. 5, Mr. CANDLER put his hand into his pocket and found that four out of eight or ten letters there were entreaties for seeds. Mr. CANDLER artfully entwined these requests with the domestic affections:

"FOLLY, LEE COUNTY, MISS., Feb. 3, 1904.

"Please send me some garden seeds. I will appreciate it very much if you will also send me a package of flower seeds."

"He not only wants the benefits to be derived from the garden seeds, but wants the flower seeds to beautify his home and make it more attractive for the good wife who presides therein."

"Here is another one:

"STURGIS, MISS., Feb. 3, 1905.

"Please send me some cotton seed, and I will appreciate it also if you will send me a package of garden seeds."

"Here is another one:

"VENONA, MISS., Feb. 3, 1904.

"Please send me some flower seed."

"A modest request from a most excellent lady. God bless the ladies! They are God's nobles, sweetest, and best gift to man, and I am always delighted to hear from them and to comply with their requests when possible. [Applause.]"

Still unabashed, the Texarkanian asked if Mr. CANDLER had not received requests for clothing.

"Mr. CANDLER—Oh, yes, I received a letter from one gentleman requesting a hat for himself, [laughter] and also one for his wife—a man in Mississippi never forgets his wife's [laughter]."

And because a man asks for hats or "panta's" is no reason he shouldn't get seeds. Mr. CANDLER "paid a magnificent tribute" to the farmers:

"I may be called a 'seedman' rather than a 'statesman' because I stand here and advocate the distribution of seed to the people, and especially to the farmers; but you may call me what you please, and name me what you may, as long as I stay here, so help me God, I will raise my voice in the farmer's interest and contend for those things which I believe to be for his good, and thereby help him if I can, and by helping him benefit all the people, because to him we owe more in the past, and we are going to owe more in the future, than we owe to any other class of our citizenship. [Great applause.]"

Finally he summarized the Hon. JOHN TROTWOOD MOORE's "tribute" to the farmer's hand:

"It may be misshapen and its joints large from strain and toil, and the veins may run through it like channels of a stream deep and wide, and it may be curved in like the turn of a plough handle and deep set like the grip of an axe handle, and deep set and scarred. But if to-day there comes an upheaval of the earth in the fusion of rock and matter, and this land, of all earth's civilization, alone leaves its imprint there to be read of ages hence by beings of enlightenment and light in the museums of a higher civilization, may it stand embedded in some kindred block of stone, not to point to the name and lineage of some prehistoric race, but through all the ages of time it would stand as the 'Track of duty,' the 'Emblem of patriotism' in the Man of earth. [Prolonged applause.]"

Thus did the farmer's hand, deep set like the grip of an axe handle, spank the young gentleman from Texarkana, and thus did Mr. CANDLER endear himself to the ladies and the farmers. Has Mr. SHEPPARD impudence enough left to say that the people at the rural post offices ridicule the boon of Government seeds? Eons of ages hence, will not the \$202,000 worth of seeds sown in 40,000,000 packages by the Government be wondered at by all beings of enlightenment and light?

The Hon. BENJAMIN B. ODIERNO followed an illustrious example when he turned a funeral into a political conference. He was SEEN LOW who, in 1897, started the fashion. He tried to get a little help from the death of HENRY GEORGE in a manner that shocked even the most hardened politicians. With this example before him, can Mr. ODIERNO be blamed if he follows it?

The broad and fertile acres of the District of Columbia lie fallow and barren because there is no school of practical agriculture for its citizens, and Congress has been asked, in a bill introduced by Representative RIXBY, by request, to provide an institution wherein instruction shall be given "in all branches of rural industry," to prepare pupils for actual farming and country life. The District has no share in the prosperity of the wheat growing States, and its cotton and corn exports are negligible quantities. Who will dare predict that, stimulated and nurtured by an annual appropriation, agriculture within the bounds of the national capital would not become an industry of paramount importance?

The Hon. WALTER ROSCOE STUBBS of Lawrence, Douglas county, Kan., is the man who overthrew Governor WILLIS J. BAILEY's Statehouse ring and drove Governor BAILEY out of the race for a renomination. Mr. STUBBS builds railroads when he is not smashing a political ring. The theory on which he worked the downfall of Governor BAILEY is disclosed in this philosophical utterance directed to him:

"The bigger the machine the more jacks you can get under it. Every voter has a jack. The only thing needed is to get the voter interested or encouraged to use his jack. The thing will go over as sure as the Kansas machine did."

The Stubbs idea worked famously in Kansas. E. W. HOCH, the Stubbs candidate for Governor, is to be congratulated on having such a master of jacks for a friend.

AMERICAN SYMPATHIES.

Russia as well as Japan Has Her Friends Here in This Crisis.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: As the American papers endeavoring to entangle sympathy for Japan in their present struggle with Russia reflect the true sentiment of the American people? On the basis of the American sense of fair play, perhaps we might on a cursory look favor the smaller and seemingly weaker nation. But an exhaustive study of the situation fails to show any great discrepancy in the strength of the combatants when we consider the conditions against which Russia must contend to maintain her military forces so far from their base.

The American public should not be too hasty in condemning a Power which was our sole European friend during the dark days of the Rebellion. F. J. M. NEW HAVEN, Feb. 13.

England, Japan and Russia.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: As might be expected, the "yellow dog" element in this country is throwing up its collective hat over the dubious, if not disreputable, victory of the yellow men of Port Arthur. It is safe to assume that the men who are the same class of men, if not the lineal descendants of the men who encouraged and sustained the English-Hessian forces in American Revolutionary days.

Every man who has knowledge of so-called "world politics" must know that Japan's war is England's war. The Pirate Empire has egged the Japanese on to a conflict which must prove suicidal to Japan. It has sought to fill that little upstart nation, and has succeeded in its purpose, with an idea that it is one of the world's powers. It has wheedled Japan into acting as a monkey to pull its chestnuts out of the international fire. England dare not attack Russia herself. When she last made war on Russia she did not attempt to do so, but she humiliated Turkey, France and Sardinia into helping her.

During the dark days of our civil war the United States had only one friend among the nations. England was the active ally of the South. France was at least friendly. Spain, Germany, and Italy likewise. While England was building and manning pirate ships for the Southern Confederacy to enable it to prey on our commerce, Russia was fitting out another fleet. That Russian fleet appeared in the waters of New York Bay. It came to anchor off New York City, and the United States which then feared that England would come out boldly and make actual open warfare against us. It is needless to say that England helped the South during the four weary years of the war.

Russia is a Christian nation. Its people are white. Its claim to the respect of other nations of white men is, among other things, that it is a nation of white men. It is one of its "tyrant" Emperors liberated 7,000,000 serfs. The man or nation that forgets a friend is a viper.

NEW YORK, Feb. 14.

Finland and Kishineff.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Would Rosseter Johnson accept Russia's treatment of the natives of Finland as a legitimate means to a legitimate end to secure a port of entry on the Atlantic?

The incident of civil war days, when the Russian fleet appeared off New York City, and the United States which then feared that England would come out boldly and make actual open warfare against us. It is needless to say that England helped the South during the four weary years of the war.

NEW YORK, Feb. 14.

The Sick Woman of Asia.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: If this is the sick man of Europe, isn't China now, or soon to be, the sick woman of Asia?

ONKONTA, N. Y., Feb. 13. O. W. PECK.

From a Citizen With a Scotch Name.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Rosseter Johnson makes a plea for the maintenance of our traditional friendship for Russia in this morning's paper. I, for one, should have little to object, vague and ill-sounded thought it be, did he not go out of his way to say, by way of illustration, that "England premeditated the murder of the two African princes."

Will Mr. Johnson answer the following questions? Was not the immediate cause of the Boer war the refusal of the Transvaal Government to grant the franchise to the men who were making of the country?

Has Japan a fair grievance against Russia? Has Russia been for months playing the game of bluff with the negotiations to give to her war preparations, just as Kruger played to hoodwink Milner and Chamberlain about the Uitlander franchise?

As to this much talked-about friendship for Russia, with its one myological episode to give it point, for goodness' sake why doesn't some one sit down to write for us convincingly about it?

Suppose Japan's quarrel against Russia were ours; suppose she were choking us out of existence to the West—what, indeed, she has been trying to do—where would this sentimental friendship of ours be? Finally, when Rosseter Johnson is seeking occasion to malign England, why does he not take the one which is paid to his hand?

Will Mr. Johnson "Hand off" to the three bullets in 1870, there would have been no war then, and there would be none now. But she didn't, because for one thing she couldn't depend on even a moral support from this country. Even so recently as this she refused to let the lion of the West, the United States, to do her bidding. Not till 1898 did we come of age and begin to understand the rules of the game.

DUNCAN MACDONALD.

BROOKLYN, Feb. 13.

From a Citizen With an Irish Name.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Much as I sympathize with the Catholic Poles and the Jews who have been persecuted by Russia, I cannot allow that sympathy to weigh for one second against American interests.

We have a Monroe Doctrine. We must have the Panama Canal and a strong navy, or that doctrine would be no more than empty brag.

Looking at the war as a question of straight business simply, we must remember that Russia was a practical friend in need in our civil war. We have nothing to do with her motive. The fact remains: There is no danger that Russia will attack our Monroe Doctrine.

If our Monroe Doctrine should be attacked in the future by England, or Germany, or Italy, or France, or Russia, or Japan, the aid of a strong European Power, on their flank, would be of much more practical use to us than the cheap sympathy of an Asiatic Power like Japan.

Gratitude is defined as an expectation of favors to come, and on the ground of favors past and favors to come, American interests—which are above all interests—would seem to demand an attitude of friendly neutrality toward Russia on the part of all patriotic Americans.

NEW YORK, Feb. 13. MICHAEL CONCORAN.

From a Citizen With a German Name.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: What is to be gained by the United States aiding in protecting the Chinese Empire from disruption?

A coalition with Great Britain or any other Power to guarantee the same, means that eventually some part of the fated Empire will become a possession of the United States Government.

Parties who guard the integrity of China can only take their compensation in territory, and with the territory, of course, goes the people.

This would mean that the laws enforcing Chinese immigration could not be enforced between two parts of United States territory.

Neutrality in all its phases is the best policy for the United States, and one which will not embroil us in a costly war, that might not only be to the disadvantage of other Powers, but might also disintegrate our forces and leave more important territories and responsibilities unguarded.

CARL EICKEMEYER.

YONKERS, Feb. 14.

DISRAELI'S ASIATIC POLICY.

The Great Semitic Statesman's Dream of British Empire.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: As you have done me the honor of inserting my letter on the "Monroe Doctrine of Asia," I should like to make a communication with regard to what I know to have been the central Asian policy of the eminent Semitic statesman Lord Beaconsfield. It would seem to indicate what would have been the action of this great leader in the present juncture of affairs in reference to Russia and Japan.

I am afraid that in order to give some weight to my remarks it will be necessary for me to state how the Lord Beaconsfield's views, the first meeting between Sir Lewis Pelly, the Plenipotentiary Extraordinary of the Queen of England, and Syud Noor Muhammad, the Afghan Plenipotentiary from the Ameer of Cabul, took place in his library at Peshawar in January, 1877.

One of the things which I had no official position in that conference, being the Government examiner in the Afghan language. I was frequently employed to make things clear to the Cabul envoy in private conversations. At that time Great Britain had no designs on Afghanistan, and merely wanted a highway for her troops in order to attack Russia in central Asia. And I should add that I am the only individual living who took part in those negotiations.

Sir Lewis Pelly was assisted by Dr. Bellie and Mr. Jenkins (who was assassinated in Cabul), and Syud Noor Muhammad and his Afghan secretary are all dead. The Cabul envoy died during the conference, and I was with him during his last moments. And it is also of interest to know that the two factors in this remarkable event have passed away—her Majesty Queen Victoria; Lord Beaconsfield, Lord Salisbury, Lord Lytton and Sir Bartle Frere. In reading through Mr. John Morley's recent "Life of Gladstone" I have been much struck with the way in which Lord Beaconsfield's notable policy with reference to Russia has been allured over. He speaks of the "baseless quarrel picked with Shere Ali in Afghanistan," and altogether ignores the fact that Russia contemplated an advance on British India through Afghanistan, and that the American absolutely refused to fall in line with the British policy. If you read between the lines you will see that there was an estrangement between the Queen and Mr. Gladstone even to the very end. Mr. Gladstone intimates as much in